

## Draft Table of Potential BDCP Near-Term Actions and Criteria for Evaluation

The following draft table depicts the consultant's initial thoughts on the expected ability of potential near-term BDCP actions to meet the following list of criteria. Other near-term actions that could be considered include, but are not limited to: re-operation of the DCC and an intertie south of Clifton Court Forebay.

	<b>Potential Near-Term Action</b>			
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>SDIP</b>	<b>Franks Tract (3-Mile Slough)</b>	<b>2-Gate project</b>	<b>Isolated Old River Corridor (4-Gates)</b>
Magnitude of expected benefit to covered fish	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Benefits of project are primarily for agriculture.</li> <li>Head of Old River fish control gate would likely reduce the movement of fall-/late fall-run Chinook salmon into the south Delta via Old River.</li> <li>Additional benefit possible for passage of adult migrating salmonids during Sep-Oct closure of Old River to increase low DO in Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gate would reduce movement of delta and longfin smelt into central Delta via 3-Mile Slough.</li> <li>Fish in San Joaquin River are pushed downstream, minimizing exposure to the central Delta</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gates would reduce movement of delta and longfin smelt in the "zone of control" into the central Delta</li> <li>Structure designed to minimize predator habitat</li> <li>Gates would reduce entrainment of particles into CVP/SWP in Old River, but no reduction (in fact entrainment increases) at other east and south Delta locations (A. Munevar, pers. comm.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gates would reduce entrainment of particles into CVP/SWP in Old River, but no reduction (in fact entrainment increases) at other east and south Delta locations (A. Munevar, pers. comm.)</li> </ul>
Certainty of expected benefit to covered fish	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Based on effectiveness of temporary rock barriers at the HORB, certainty of magnitude is high.</li> <li>Based on DSM2 modeling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Based on preliminary results</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Based on DSM2 modeling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Based on DSM2 modeling</li> </ul>

	<b>Potential Near-Term Action</b>			
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>SDIP</b>	<b>Franks Tract (3-Mile Slough)</b>	<b>2-Gate project</b>	<b>Isolated Old River Corridor (4-Gates)</b>
Time needed for implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Once permitted, 2 years needed for construction (P. Marshall, pers. comm.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Possibly by 2012 (V. Pacheco, pers. comm.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By 2010 (D. Majors, pers. comm.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unknown, may require significant infrastructure (dredging, channel widening, 4 gates)</li> </ul>
Consistency with BDCP Goals and Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consistent with BDCP co-equal goals of water supply and fish protection</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consistent with BDCP co-equal goals of water supply and fish protection</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consistent with BDCP co-equal goals of water supply and fish protection</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consistent with BDCP co-equal goals of water supply and fish protection</li> </ul>
Compatibility with other near-term actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not compatible with an isolated Old River corridor – Old River would be closed during periods of year under SDIP.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, but “tricky to have [2-gate and Franks Tract projects] work compatibly” (D. Majors pers. comm.)</li> <li>May not be necessary to do this with 2-gate project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, but “tricky to have [2-gate and Franks Tract projects] work compatibly” (D. Majors pers. comm.)</li> <li>May not be necessary to do this with Franks Tract project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not compatible with SDIP – Old River must remain open under the Isolated Old River action</li> </ul>
Compatibility with long-term actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes – one of 3 planning goals is to develop water quality and fish protection consistent with long-term planning efforts (DWR 2008)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, but designed to be temporary</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, but reduces benefits to habitat restoration</li> </ul>
Ability to transition into long-term actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, but may not be necessary with limited south Delta diversions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, but designed to be temporary</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, siphon for canal could be added</li> </ul>
Reversibility/Not a stranded investment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Permanent gates proposed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Permanent gates proposed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Temporary gates could be easily removed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant infrastructure required</li> </ul>

Potential Near-Term Action				
Criteria	SDIP	Franks Tract (3-Mile Slough)	2-Gate project	Isolated Old River Corridor (4-Gates)
Potential negative effects on BDCP covered species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May affect 13 federal or state-listed species or designated critical habitat, including delta smelt, green sturgeon, steelhead, and winter-run and spring-run Chinook salmon, although mitigation measures would be implemented (SDIP ASIP 2006).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Structure may attract predators</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“Zone of influence” is only location at which fish benefits are found</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Entrainment increases at other east and south Delta locations (A. Munevar pers. comm.)</li> </ul>
Cost of implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$110 million</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$50-130 million, depending on design and location</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$26.5 million</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>???</li> </ul>

## References

DWR. 2008. Franks Tract Project. News Update 1. September 2008. Available at:  
<http://www.water.ca.gov/frankstract/docs/FTNewsupdate1.pdf>

USBR and DWR. 2006. South Delta Improvements Program. Action Specific Implementation Plan. June 2006. Available at:  
[http://baydeltaoffice.water.ca.gov/sdb/sdip/documents/asip/asip\\_doc.html](http://baydeltaoffice.water.ca.gov/sdb/sdip/documents/asip/asip_doc.html)

## Personal Communication

Major, Dennis. Engineer, MWDSC. Presentation to BDCP Integration Team on 2-Gate Project. 2/3/09.

Marshall, Paul. Engineer, DWR. Presentation to BDCP Integration Team on SDIP. 2/3/09.

Munevar, Armin. Engineer, CH2M Hill. Presentation to BDCP HOTT Team on particle tracking results of an Isolated Old River Corridor. 7/30/08.

Pacheco, Victor. Engineer, DWR. Presentation to BDCP Integration Team on Franks Tract Project. 2/3/09.